

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA  
MARTINSBURG**

**GABE REITTER, III,**

Petitioner,

v.

**CRIMINAL ACTION NO. 3:07-cv-115  
(BAILEY)**

**WALLY A. PHILLIPS,**

Respondent.

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

On this day, the above-styled matter came before the Court for consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge James E. Seibert. By Standing Order this action was referred to Magistrate Judge Seibert for submission of a proposed report and a recommendation ("R & R"). Magistrate Judge Seibert filed his R & R on April 11, 2008 [Doc. 9]. In that filing, the magistrate judge recommended that this Court grant the respondent's Motion to Dismiss [Doc. 6] and to deny and dismiss the petitioner's § 2241 petition [Doc. 1].

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1) (c), this Court is required to make a *de novo* review of those portions of the magistrate judge's findings to which objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. **Thomas v. Arn**, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). In addition, failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo*


review and the right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); **Snyder v. Ridenour**, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); **United States v. Schronce**, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). Here, objections to Magistrate Judge Seibert's R & R were due within ten (10) days of receipt, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(b). The docket indicates that the petitioner accepted service of the R & R on April 11, 2008. See Doc. 10. No objections have been filed. Accordingly, this Court will review the report and recommendation for clear error.

Upon careful review of the report and recommendation, it is the opinion of this Court that the **Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation [Doc. 9]** should be, and is, hereby **ORDERED ADOPTED** for the reasons more fully stated in the magistrate judge's report. Accordingly, the Court is of the opinion that the Motion to Dismiss **[Doc. 6]** should be, and hereby is, **GRANTED**. As such, this Court hereby **DENIES and DISMISSES** the petitioner's § 2241 petition **[Doc. 1]**. Therefore, the matter is hereby **ORDERED STRICKEN** from the active docket of this Court.

It is so **ORDERED**.

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to any counsel of record and to mail a copy to the *pro se* petitioner.

**DATED:** May 6, 2008.



JOHN PRESTON BAILEY  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE